



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/630,335

07/30/2003

Chen Sun

32240/004001

8747

22511 7590 04/17/2008

OSHA LIANG L.L.P.
1221 MCKINNEY STREET
SUITE 2800
HOUSTON, TX 77010

EXAMINER

SWEARINGEN, JEFFREY R

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2145

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/17/2008

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docketing@oshaliang.com
buta@oshaliang.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/630,335	Applicant(s) SUN, CHEN	
	Examiner Jeffrey R. Swearingen	Art Unit 2145	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 December 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-5 and 12-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-5 and 12-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This case has been assigned to a new examiner.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 3-5, and 12-32 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. The claims are generally narrative and indefinite, failing to conform with current U.S. practice. They appear to be a literal translation into English from a foreign document and are replete with grammatical and idiomatic errors.

5. Claims 1, 3-5, and 12-32 are rejected as failing to define the invention in the manner required by 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

The claim(s) are narrative in form and replete with indefinite and functional or operational language. The structure which goes to make up the device must be clearly and positively specified. The structure must be organized and correlated in such a manner as to present a complete operative device. The claim(s) must be in one sentence form only. Note the format of the claims in the patent(s) cited.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1, 3-5, and 12-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reisman (US 7,062,561) in view of Polonsky et al. (US 7,072,984).
8. In regard to claims 1, 26, 28, 31, Reisman disclosed a system wherein URLs are linked with potential names to allow for access of a mistyped URL. Reisman, column 12, lines 1-37. (*providing a*

Art Unit: 2145

plurality of URL names to multiple domain name servers, wherein each of the plurality of URL names comprises a third level domain name and a second level domain name, the third level domain name being a representation of a name of the first individual, wherein at least one of the plurality of URL names has a file suffix; providing a first profile of the first individual to a first web page accessible using Internet http addressing with a first URL name of the plurality of URL names; providing a second profile of the first individual to a second web page accessible using Internet http addressing with a second URL name of the plurality of URL names; providing a third profile of a second individual to a third web page accessible using Internet http addressing with a third URL name of the plurality of URL names; inputting the first URL name, the second URL name, and the third URL name into the Internet connected application to obtain an inputted first URL name, an inputted second URL name, and an inputted third URL name; extracting at least one identity of the first individual based on the third level domain names and the second level domain names of the inputted first URL name, and the inputted second URL name; and organizing the first profile, the second profile, and the third profile according to the at least one identity in the Internet connected application). Reisman provides for connecting guessed names to URLs based on domain name directories. Reisman, column 14, lines 5-26. Reisman failed to disclose the organization of profiles dealing with the URL names. However, Polonsky disclosed the conversion of URI information into a schema used for translating events into an accessible http request utilizing XML. Polonsky, column 23, lines 51-60; column 24, lines 46-63. Normalization is applied to the content to reduce the data content and allow the user to browse only the content of interest. Polonsky, column 26, lines 16-23. Reisman dealt with allowing a user to access mistyped URL information. Reisman, column 5, lines 59-67. Polonsky deals with organizing content customized for the user based on information provided by the user, which is translated as appropriate. Polonsky, column 1, lines 57-67, column 3, lines 50-57. In order to limit bandwidth usage and provide the user with the appropriately intended content which the user wanted to access, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Reisman with the teachings of Polonsky.

9. In regard to claim 3, Reisman further disclosed:

Art Unit: 2145

wherein the first individual is identified using the third level domain name and the second level domain name associated with the at least one identity within an eCommerce site. Reisman, column 14, lines 46-62

10. In regard to claim 4, Reisman further disclosed:

wherein the first individual is identified using the third level domain name and the second level domain name associated with the at least one identity within an employment site. Reisman, column 14, lines 46-62

11. In regard to claim 5, Reisman further disclosed:

wherein the first individual is identified using the third level domain name and the second level domain name associated with the at least one identity within a matchmaking site. Reisman, column 14, lines 46-62

12. In regard to claim 12, Reisman further disclosed:

wherein the second individual is identified using the third level domain name and the second level domain name associated with the at least one identity within the eCommerce site. Reisman, column 14, lines 46-62

13. In regard to claim 13, Reisman further disclosed:

wherein the second individual is identified using the third level domain name and the second level domain name associated with the at least one identity within the matchmaking site. Reisman, column 14, lines 46-62

14. In regard to claim 14, Reisman further disclosed:

wherein the first individual is identified using the third level domain name and the second level domain name associated with the at least one identity within a contact management application.

Reisman, column 14, lines 46-62

15. In regard to claim 15, Reisman further disclosed:

wherein the second individual is identified using the third level domain name and the second level domain name associated with the at least one identity within a contact management application.

Reisman, column 14, lines 46-62

Art Unit: 2145

16. In regard to claim 16, Polonsky further disclosed:

retrieving at least a portion of the first profile, the second profile, and the third profile from the first web page, the second web page, and the third profile into the Internet connected application. Polonsky, column 25, lines 11-24

17. In regard to claims 17, 29, Polonsky further disclosed:

consolidating a first data field of the first profile with a second data field of the second profile if the third level domain names of the first URL name and the second URL name are identical, the second level domain names of the first URL name and the second URL name are identical, and the first data field and the second data field consist of same data, and wherein the consolidation comprises removing a duplicated data. Polonsky, column 24, lines 4-62

18. In regard to claims 18, 27, 30, 32, Polonsky further disclosed:

prioritizing a first data field of the first profile with a second data field of the second profile if the third level domain names of the first URL name and the second URL name are identical, the second level domain names of the first URL name and the second URL name are identical, and the first data field and the second data field consist of different data. Polonsky, column 23, line 51 – column 24, line 32.

19. In regard to claim 19, Reisman further disclosed:

searching a plurality of data fields of the first profile, the second profile, and the third profile based on the at least one identity of the first individual. Reisman, column 14, lines 46-62

20. In regard to claim 20, Reisman further disclosed:

storing the inputted first URL name, the inputted second URL name, the inputted third URL name, and the at least one identity of the first individual on a web server. Reisman, column 14, lines 46-62

21. In regard to claim 21, Reisman further disclosed:

storing the inputted first URL name, the inputted second URL name, the inputted third URL name, and the at least one identity of the first individual on a local device running the Internet connected application. Reisman, column 14, lines 46-62

22. In regard to claim 22, Polonsky further disclosed:

Art Unit: 2145

storing at least a portion of the first profile and the second profile in the Internet connected application after the organizing. Polonsky, column 25, lines 50-56

23. In regard to claim 23, Reisman further disclosed:

the second level domain name of the inputted first URL name of at least one of the plurality of URL names and the inputted second URL name of at least one of the plurality of URL names is different.

Reisman, column 14, lines 46-62

24. In regard to claim 24, Reisman further disclosed:

communicating a brand identity of the first individual from the internet connected application based on the at least one identity of the first individual. Reisman, column 14, lines 46-62

25. In regard to claim 25, Polonsky further disclosed:

the plurality of URL names are configurable to append web access prefixes to form an internet link to an eCommerce profile of the first individual. Polonsky, column 26, lines 11-24

Conclusion

26. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

27. Lucovsky et al. US 7,302,634

28. Basko et al. US 6,917,972

29. Reed et al. US 5,862,325

30. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2145

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffrey R. Swearingen whose telephone number is (571)272-3921. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jason Cardone can be reached on 571-272-3933. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Jeffrey R. Swearingen
Examiner
Art Unit 2145

/J. R. S./
Examiner, Art Unit 2145

/Jason D Cardone/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2145